



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,242	07/03/2003	Rolf Cremerius	GKNG 1159 PUS	4751

7590 07/24/2006
Robert P. Renke
Suite 250
28333 Telegraph Road
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER

HONG, JOHN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3726

DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

10/613,242

Applicant(s)

CREMERIUS, ROLF

Examiner

John C. Hong

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,11,13,14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,11,13,14,16- 17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,2,5,6,13,14,16,18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oetiker (U.S. Patent 5001816) in view of Hess (U.S. Patent 1967821).

Regarding Claims 1 and 18, Oetiker teaches:

A: A method of producing metal clamping rings (column 1 lines 11-13).

B: For securing sleeves made of an elastic material (84, column 6 lines 38-39, lines 45-47) on components which are movable relative to one another (column 6 lines 40-45).

C: Producing a strip portion from plate metal (column 5 lines 1-4, column 6 lines 21-23).

D: The strip portion comprising strip ends (figures 1-4, which match and complement one another (ends 1 and 5 in figures 1-4). To match or to complement means to fit or join together.

E: The strip ends are delimited so as to be undercut-free in the longitudinal direction (column 6 lines 21-26).

F: Bending the strip portion substantially circular to form a cylindrical ring with abutting strip ends (column 6 lines 25-30).

G: Welding the strip ends to form a clamping ring (column 3 lines 9-14).

Oetiker fails to teach the step of producing includes cutting the strip ends to each have a single straight edge which extends at a right angle relative to the longitudinal direction of the strip portion.

Hess teaches the step of producing includes cutting the strip ends to each have a single straight edge which extends at a right angle relative to the longitudinal direction of the strip portion (Fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the step of the step of producing includes cutting the strip ends to each have a single straight edge which extends at a right angle relative to the longitudinal direction of the strip portion, as taught by Hess on the method of Oetiker so as to manufacture a ring without any complication.

Regarding claim 2, Oetiker teaches cutting a coil or long strip band material into desired lengths (column 6 lines 21-23).

Regarding Claim(s) 14, Oetiker teaches welding the strip ends together using point welding (column 4 line 7).

Regarding Claim(s) 5, 16 and 19, Oetiker teach the limitation except of the step of producing includes cutting the strip ends to each have a single straight edge which extends at an oblique angle relative to the longitudinal direction of the strip portion.

Hess teaches the step of producing includes cutting the strip ends to each have a single straight edge which extends at an oblique angle relative to the longitudinal direction of the strip portion (Fig.13)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the step of the step of producing includes cutting the strip ends to each have a single straight edge which extends at an oblique angle relative to the longitudinal direction of the strip portion, as taught by Hess on the method of Oetiker so as to manufacture a ring without any complication.

3. Claims 11, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oetiker/Hess as applied to claim 1 and 5 above, and further in view of EP288884.

Oetiker/Hess teach the limitation except the step of welding includes at least one laser welding, plasma welding or electron-beam welding.

'884 teaches a laser welding process for joining two strip ends together (Abstract lines 9-11; Figs 1 and 2)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the step of a laser welding process for joining two strip ends together, as taught by '886 on the method of Oetiker/Hess, so as to not only join the two strip edges together, but to do so in a less destructive way by not introducing excessive heat.

Regarding claims 3-6, Oetiker discloses cutting the strip ends to have straight edges which extend at right angles, or any angle, relative to the Longitudinal direction of the strip portion (column 6 lines 21-23). This is best illustrated in figure 5. Edge of 9 on right side is a straight edge perpendicular to edge of band 1 and 5.

4. Claim 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oetiker in view of Hess and Steingroever (U.S. Patent 5813264)

Oetiker and Hess teach the limitation except the step of upsetting the clamping ring electro-magnetically.

Steingroever teaches the step of upsetting the clamping ring electro-magnetically (col. 3, lines 66 – col. 4, line 6 :Figs 7-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the step of upsetting the clamping ring electro-magnetically, as taught by Steingroever on the method of Oetiker/Hess so as to evenly deform the clamping ring around the sleeve.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2,5,6,11,14,16-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See the new Office action.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 3726

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John C. Hong whose telephone number is 571-272-4529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(07:00-16:30)First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on 571-272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



John C. Hong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3726

jh
July 19, 2006